

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FOUR

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ERNESTO ROSAS, JR.,

Defendant and Appellant.

B260093

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. TA131226)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,
Patrick Connolly, Judge.

Jasmine Patel, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant.

No appearance for Respondent.

On December 4, 2014, appellant, a self-admitted gang member, approached the victim, the victim's brother, the victim's cousin, and the victim's fiancée at the victim's restaurant. Appellant said he was there to collect money owed to the Mexican Mafia. Appellant told the victim that if he did not pay \$7,000 within the hour, he would be killed. The victim's fiancée called the police, and appellant was arrested at the restaurant.

On October 22, 2014, appellant pled no contest to one count of attempted extortion, and admitted related gang allegations. He was sentenced to seven years to life. Appellant filed a timely notice of appeal, and requested a certificate of probable cause, which was denied. After examining the record, appointed appellate counsel filed a brief raising no issues, but asking this court to independently review the record on appeal pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441-442. (See *Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 264.)¹

On June 10, 2015, we advised appellant he had 30 days within which to submit by brief or letter any contentions or argument he wished this court to consider. No response was received.

This court has examined the entire record in accordance with *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at pages 441-442, and is satisfied appellant's attorney has fully complied with the responsibilities of counsel, and no arguable issues exist. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of conviction.

¹ Appellate counsel filed a request with the superior court to correct appellant's presentence custody credits. In response, on June 12, 2015, an amended abstract of judgment was filed, showing an increase in custody credits from 386 to 646.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS.

MANELLA, J.

We concur:

EPSTEIN, P. J.

WILLHITE, J.